APPENDIX C: ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX

APPENDIX A: RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Overview

A Remedial Investigation of the Naval Reactors Facility Industrial Waste Ditch (Operable Unit 8-07) was performed due to known discharges of waste water containing organic and inorganic constituents. Track 2 investigations were performed on nine suspected historical landfill areas (Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06) based on past disposal practices of wastes similar to those found in municipal landfills. The Proposed Plan was released to the public on April 9, 1994, with a comment period from April 12 to May 12, 1994. The Proposed Plan summarized remedial action alternatives for the two different types of investigations and was the first to include Track 2 investigations for public comment. The agencies determined that each Track 2 site would need to be presented in a Proposed Plan in order to formalize decisions on Track 2 sites. Agency representatives proposed no action for the Industrial Waste Ditch and, based upon cleanup remedies used at similar sites, recommended containment of three historical landfill areas.

This Responsiveness Summary recaps and responds to the comments received during the comment period. In general, comments supported the selected alternatives. Several commentors offered suggestions on cleanup methods for the Track 2 investigations to be considered during the remedial design phase. A few comments opposed implementation of the preferred remedial alternatives, but supported an action of some type. Written comments were submitted in writing during the comment period and verbal comments were received during public meetings held the week of April 18, 1994.

Community Involvement Highlights

Informative Publications

The March issue of the *INEL Reporter* contained an events calendar highlighting public involvement activities scheduled for the Naval Reactors Facility.

The INEL Citizens Guide to Environmental Restoration at the INEL contained updates on projects at the Naval Reactors Facility and was distributed on April 9, 1994 to 7,500 citizens.

An informative update on the investigations completed at the Naval Reactors Facility was provided through an update fact sheet on both the Industrial Waste Ditch and landfill projects. The fact sheets were distributed to approximately 7,500 citizens via the INEL Community Relations Plan mailing list on March 17, 1994, and conveyed general information concerning public involvement opportunities.

In March 1994, the *INEL News*, a newspaper distributed to all employees, published an article concerning the Naval Reactors Facility Proposed Plan and associated public meetings.

Notice of Availability

The first public informational meetings ever held concerning environmental restoration investigations performed at the Naval Reactors Facility were announced in a Notice of Availability display ad. Display ads were published in eight major Idaho newspapers between March 15 and March 23, 1994: the *Post Register* in Idaho Falls, *Idaho State Journal* in

Pocatello, *South Idaho Press* in Burley, *Times News* in Twin Falls, *Idaho Statesman* in Boise, *Idaho Press Tribune* in Nampa, *Lewiston Morning Tribune* in Lewiston, and *The Daily News* in Moscow. Personal telephone calls were made to key individual stakeholders, environmental groups, and community organizations from INEL regional offices in Pocatello, Twin Falls, Boise, and Moscow.

Press Release

During the week of March 27, 1994, a press release regarding the Naval Reactors Facility public meetings and general information on the investigations was released to approximately 40 media centers for dissemination to the public. Also during this time, an electronic mail press release was sent to INEL employees.

Information Sessions/Briefings

Prior to holding the public meetings, information sessions were held at the Pine Ridge Mall in Pocatello on April 12, 1994, from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m., and the INEL regional office in Twin Falls on April 14, 1994, from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Representatives from the Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare attended these events to discuss the project and answer questions. On April 13, 1994, agency representatives conducted a technical briefing via a teleconference call with members of the League of Woman Voters in Moscow and the Environmental Defense Institute.

The Community Relations Plan coordinator and INEL Twin Falls regional office personnel participated in two radio talk shows; talk shows were broadcast from Burley on April 13th and from Jerome on April 14, 1994. Topics covered during the radio shows included information on the public meetings, how the public could obtain information on the projects, locations of the local INEL regional office, and other upcoming public involvement opportunities.

Newspaper and radio advertisements regarding the information sessions at Pocatello and Twin Falls were run during the week of April 10, 1994. Advertisements were placed in two local newspapers and radio advertisements were broadcast by six local stations in both Pocatello, Burley and Twin Falls for three days - five times a day at each station.

Public Meetings

Public meetings on the Naval Reactors Facility Industrial Waste Ditch and historical landfill areas were held in Idaho Falls on April 18, Boise on April 20, and in Moscow on April 21, 1994. A total of 83 people attended the public meetings. Display sessions were held at all locations from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m., and informal discussion periods preceded each public meeting. Representatives from the Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare attended the meetings to discuss the project and answer questions. Project managers were also available to answer questions or provide detailed information during the informal discussion periods as well as during the public meetings. Each public meeting was recorded by a court reporter.

Newspaper advertisements regarding the public meetings were placed in one local newspaper in Boise, Moscow, and Idaho Falls the week of April 18, 1994. Radio advertisements were also run by nine local radio stations in Boise, Moscow, and Idaho Falls during the week of April 18, 1994 for three days - five times a day at each station.

Public Comment Period

The public comment period on the Proposed Plan for the Naval Reactors Facility was held from April 12 to May 12, 1994. No requests to extend the public comment period were received. A total of nine written comments and six verbal comments were received during the comment period for both projects presented in the Naval Reactors Facility proposed plan. No oral comments were received during the information sessions in Pocatello and Twin Falls.

This Responsiveness Summary has been prepared as part of the Record of Decision. All oral comments, as given at the public meetings, and all written comments, as submitted, are repeated verbatim. If appropriate, individual comments have been further broken down and categorized in order for DOE to address specific issues raised by each commentor. A matrix is provided that associates the numbered comment in the Responsiveness Summary to the commentor. The Department of Energy has provided a response to each comment and/or issue raised by the commentors. If the comment impacted the agencies' decision outlined in the Record of Decision, this fact is highlighted and impacts are identified.

The Naval Reactors Facility Record of Decision presents the No Action alternative for the Industrial Waste Ditch, the presumptive remedy of containment for three landfill areas, and No Action for six landfill areas. The decisions meet and satisfy the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act. The decision for these projects is based on information contained in the Administrative Record.

Copies of the Proposed Plan and the entire Administrative Record are available to the public in six regional INEL information repositories: the INEL Technical Library in Idaho Falls; University of Idaho Library in Moscow; Shoshone-Bannock Library in Fort Hall; and INEL regional offices located in Pocatello, Twin Falls, and Boise.

Summary of Comments Received During Public Comment Period

Comments on both the Naval Reactors Facility Industrial Waste Ditch and Landfill Units submitted during the entire comment period are addressed and categorized in separate sections below. Responses address issues pertinent to the IWD and Landfill Units. Alpha/numerical characters contained in brackets after the comment relate the comment to the commentor in the matrix provided in Appendix B.

Naval Reactors Facility Industrial Waste Ditch

General Comments on Proposed Alternatives

General Background Information on the Naval Reactors Facility

1. **Comment:** The way these systems operate is that when you put water in the ditch, most of it seeps in the ground. A little bit evaporates, usually 10 percent or less evaporated. Most of it infiltrates into the ground, goes down through the sand, gravel, silt, and clay down to the top of the basalt.

   And while basalt in itself is highly permeable, some of the most permeable rocks any where in the country, the top of the basalt usually spreads the water out, contrary to your drawing which was incorrect. But it spreads the water out, and the perched water is above the basalt, not in the top of the basalt.

   It spreads it out, which is a really good system because the sediments, as the water moves through, removes a lot of the contaminants. And then spreads out and seeps down in much smaller quantities and then can be perched on other sediment beds within the basalt beds. And each one of these helps remove contaminants. And so the system has a lot of natural cleanup just during the operation of it.

   And the fact that the aquifer is like 365 feet below there is a long way with a lot of these processes to attenuate the waste. And then the monitoring we have done over the past 30 years in the Snake River Plain Aquifer below Naval Reactors Facility has only shown plumes of sodium and chloride principally and a little bit of nitrate at times, so it doesn't show any of the heavy metals. And so the system has operated over the years, you already have the conclusion that there's not many contaminants going down. (T-I3)

   And I carried a deal in the legislature this year that to my knowledge is the first in Idaho that introduces the fact that risk is a very viable thing in looking at any contaminants. We'll never be able to afford to clean up all the waste to what Lewis and Clark would have found had they drilled

a well there. But we need to spend our money wisely and always factor in what is the risk to humans with these contaminants. (T-I4)

And so I strongly support the No Action alternative with the waste ditch. And then when NRF is ever closed, I would use some native materials and fill it in. (T-I9)

Response: The agencies appreciate the time and effort that the commentor took to evaluate the material, attend the presentations, and provide comments on the information. Visual aids used in future presentations will be reviewed in detail to ensure that they are more representative of actual conditions.

Risk Assessment

2. **Comment:** While the hazard index ratings of 1.2 and 1.3 are indicative of risk if fruits and vegetables, etc., are grown in the area and persons consumed these materials. The probability of this means of uptake is extremely small due to the arid climatic conditions which render this area unsuitable for farming and due to the fact that access is controlled. Previous irrigation attempts under the Powell project in 1907 also showed insufficient water reserves for surface irrigation of the tract of land that is involved.

I am concerned however that the tack taken by the Environmental Protection Agency is overly conservative and costly in that they have considered the associated risks based on methyl mercury (an organic form of mercuric compound frequently found in grain treatment as a fungicide and rodenticide). While this is a hazardous material, it is not the form of mercury that is involved in the NRF ditch. There are many areas in the western United States where mining activities have contaminated soils with non-organic forms of mercury. Elemental mercury or nitrated forms such as found in the ditch should have the risks applied which are applicable to their type as opposed to using a non-related methyl mercury. When one looks at the broad overview of the many mining sites, which may require cleanup, the utilization of incorrect compounds in the figuring of associated risk factors could translate into excessive costs. When this is multiplied by many locations it demonstrates a callous lack of prudence and fiscal responsibility towards the taxpayers. (W-I25)

Response: The species of mercury was not identified in the laboratory analysis. The methylmercury form was used for risk assessment purposes for two reasons; microorganisms in an aquatic environment can transform inorganic mercury to methylmercury, and the risk assessment process is conservative by nature. The uncertainties of the calculations were presented in Section 6.5 of the Remedial Investigation report and were used by risk managers to reach the no further action decision. The EPA guidance provides a process for obtaining toxicological information

on substances, such as inorganic mercury, when information is not available in the published sources. If the risk calculations had shown an unacceptable risk, then the uncertainty and conservatism could have been reduced with more specific information. However, unacceptable risks were not shown using the conservative assumptions. Therefore, further refinement of the species of mercury present was not necessary.

3. **Comment:** Assessment and planning seem exceptionally thorough and well done. Too much reliance on computer modeling, unless assumptions and technical basis are periodically reevaluated based on actual physical inspection, can be very misleading and result in gross error either way. (W-B6)

Response: The commentor is correct that modeling alone should not be used. Modeling is used to standardize assessments and predict future impacts from potential releases. The selected remedy includes actual monitoring and periodic evaluations (every five years) of landfill remedial actions to ensure early detection of any potential migration of contaminants and periodically assess modeling results.

No Action Recommendation

4. **Comment:** As far as the ditch project goes, I would much rather see a lined evaporation pond being used for on-site discharges, because I don't have...I would not like to see continued washing leachate migration of those contaminants that are already in that ditch and the possibility of introducing more contaminants into the ditch. (T-M1)

Response: Field investigations indicate that there is little leaching occurring at this time, and the Baseline Risk Assessment determined that there are no unacceptable risks. The agencies have determined that the low potential for migration does not warrant the need for additional action. Additionally, the shut down of two of the three prototype plants has significantly reduced the volume of water discharged to the Industrial Waste Ditch because most of the discharge was cooling water from the prototype plants. The planned shut down of the remaining prototype plant will further reduce the discharge.

5. **Comment:** I'd like to come back to the Industrial Waste Ditch and the no treatment recommendation. I'm still struggling with the implied...or assertation that it's okay to have continued six million gallons per year or whatever, which presumably would consist largely of site runoff and so on, continuing to go through this area. To me, I guess, I'd have to know a little bit more about the costs involved if possibly relocating where the site runoff could go versus leaving it here. If it costs a few thousand dollars to relocate it, why not relocate it versus---you know, if it costs a million dollars to relocate it so it no longer runs through the polluted ditch, why, that's a different story. So I guess it's a question of what the

geography is and what it would cost to convince the runoff to go somewhere else. (T-M7)

Response: The NRF site drainage flows naturally to the northwest corner, which is the outfall of the Industrial Waste Ditch. In order to relocate site runoff, a new runoff collection system would be required which would include excavation and installation of at least 2,000 feet of piping and several lift stations. Creation of a new discharge point would cost in excess of $1 million. Because the Remedial Investigation showed that contaminant levels are only slightly above background levels, and the risk assessment determined that there is no significant health or environmental risk present, these additional costs would not be justified.

6. **Comment:** Four comments (three written and one verbal) agreed with the No Action Alternative for the NRF Industrial Waste Ditch. (W-I8, W-B10, W-I11, T-I12)

Response: The Agencies appreciate the time and effort that the commentors took to evaluate the material, attend the presentations, and provide comments on the information.

Naval Reactors Facility Landfill Units

General Comments to Proposed Alternatives

7. **Comment:** Several years ago DOE-ID created a large gravel pit about a mile north of NRF along the road way to Test Area North. It is located just beyond the Big Lost River bridge on the west side of the road as one heads north. Gravel mining stopped as the lacustrine clay layers of the Ancient Lake Terreton were encountered. The utilization of the same pit for the cover of the landfills serves several purposes:

    1. It avoids natural surface disturbance of additional areas of the site, hence larger amounts of forage and native grasses would remain for wild life. Environmental impact for this area has already been determined and money could be saved by reuse of this same area.

    2. It provides a short haul path for materials to NRF thereby saving tax dollars. I would estimate that it could be accomplished within the $2 million budget estimate of option #2.

    3. It provides a clay and silt content greater than native soils which tend to be largely alluvial gravels and loess type materials. This would improve the impervious nature of the cap.

4. The final closure of the pit could be done with a portion of the clay materials and thereby sealing the bottom of the pit. This would transform a dry pit into a water storage reservoir adjacent to the Big Lost River.

During high-water years when there is flow in the Big Lost River the gravel pit basin could be filled and provide a 20 to 25-foot-deep pond. While the INEL area near NRF area has about an 8 to 9-inch annual rainfall, the evaporation rate is about 3 to 4 times that amount, resulting in a net evaporation loss of about 2 feet per year. A pond this deep could provide a wetland environment for migrating waterfowl and a watering hole for wildlife. With the depth created, it could provide water carry-over for several years. Some funding offset may be available under wetland improvement programs or Idaho state wildlife habitat improvement programs.

With the downsizing of NRF and the reduced flows of sewage to the lagoons, and reduced Industrial Waste Ditch flows, the availability of the ditch for wildlife watering will diminish. Remediation of the gravel pit to a pond could provide the needed transitional establishment of another water source.

Currently, the state of Idaho is paying deprivation money to the farmers to the north as antelope and other wildlife seek forage and water on farmers irrigated acreages. This is largely caused by DOE-ID rerouting of the Big Lost River to diversion areas near the Big Southern Butte. Upstream irrigation uses of the water have also contributed to the loss of this traditional water source for wildlife. Nowadays water seldom flows to the traditional "sink" areas of the playas where the wildlife have migrated for centuries.

By using this pit I feel that the following can be accomplished:

a. Costs could be controlled
b. An improved product could be delivered
c. Another dry hole in the desert will not be formed
d. It provides the DOE the opportunity to finally do something positive for the environment. (W-I13)

Response: The gravel pit described in the comment will be considered as a source of material during the engineering evaluation and design of the landfill covers. The landfill covers will consist of native soil, and the limiting factor is the permeability of the cover material. The primary purposes of the cover are to prevent direct contact with the landfill contents, and reduce infiltration, which can be effectively done with native soil. If soil which meets the design criteria at a minimum cost can be found closer to the landfill areas than the referenced gravel pit, it will be used as the landfill cover. Other cost factors include excavation, transportation, contouring, compaction, and revegetation. Although the creation of a pond may improve the wildlife habitat in the area, it is unfortunately outside the scope of this remedial action. The commentor's suggestion

will be shared with the INEL organizations responsible for evaluating wildlife habitat.

8. **Comment:** As far as the characterization, that is, the self-characterization of the constituents in the landfills, I'm real dubious of that particularly within the context of what's going on right now when the Navy has refused for nearly two years to release its worker exposure and dosimetry records to the National Centers for Disease Control that's conducting the dossier construction study of workers on the INEL site and also effective off-site populations. You know, when the Navy is pulling stunts like that and refusing to release those records for those kinds of studies, I'm a little bit concerned when there's not an independent assessment of some of those records of material that may have gone into those landfill sites. That's it. (T-M14)

Response: The Agencies acknowledge that the contents of the landfill areas are not fully characterized. Available historical information was used to estimate the landfill contents. However, because of the uncertainties involved, the agencies support the selected remedy, which includes monitoring. The full characterization of a heterogenous source such as that found in municipal landfills is a costly and difficult process. As stated in the Investigation Reports, Feasibility Study, and the Record of Decision, the Agencies believe that Government funds are better spent on remedial actions rather than further characterization. The selected remedy is designed to control and monitor any releases from the sites.

9. **Comment:** Regarding the Naval Reactors Facility Industrial Waste Ditch and Landfill areas, I have read the three remedial alternatives and I recommend none of the alternatives be used. Too much risk in assuming one of the alternatives could be successful.

Use the same logic as used in the disposal of underground storage gasoline tanks (this portion of statement was unreadable due to damage to the response form in the mail)...By EPA and All...by 1998. There will be no deviation, no changes, regardless. The same decisions should be used on landfill units.

The Federal Government caused the problem, they should replace the land like it was originally. (W-I18)

Response: The methodology used for the assessment of the NRF Landfill Units is the Presumptive Remedy for CERCLA Municipal Landfill Sites. This method of capping and monitoring landfill sites has been demonstrated across the country in a variety of settings to be protective of the environment. The Agencies' expectation was that containment technologies generally would be appropriate for municipal landfill waste because the volume and heterogeneity of the waste generally make treatment impracticable. On the other hand, petroleum products are generally liquid, and leave a homogeneous waste pattern in the soil.

The investigation techniques, the remediation technologies, and the risks associated with these two types of remediation sites are significantly different, and are not readily comparable.

10. **Comment:** But my thoughts about the landfills kept coming back that there are much worse sites in the U.S. that need to be cleaned up and are right now a threat to drinking water supplies of a larger population. This problem of potential contamination after 30 years of being there doesn't appear to be an emergency whereas $2 million - the proposed expenditure - could be used better elsewhere. (W-M19)

Response: The Agencies agree that the funding for aggressive remediation should be used for high priority sites. We have evaluated the potential risk associated with these sites in comparison to other remediation projects on the INEL. Since these areas are not fully characterized, there are uncertainties regarding the site risk. To reduce these uncertainties would cost nearly as much as the selected alternative. Therefore, the Agencies believe that this level of funding is appropriate for this project. Capping the landfills and monitoring is a reasonable action to compensate for the uncertainties, and yet be protective of human health and the environment.

11. **Comment:** Agree with INEL preferred alternatives. Suggest that landfill areas be treated even more conservatively, if possible, i.e., higher integrity "cap" and frequent monitoring to assure contamination has not spread. Paint waste contains high levels of lead and other hazardous components; other industrial chemicals could have included VOCs which may move more rapidly than anticipated. (W-B20)

Response: The primary purposes of a soil cover are twofold: (1) prevent direct contact by personnel with the landfill contents, and (2) reduce infiltration. Based on the low precipitation and infiltration in this area, the installation of a clay cover would not provide enough additional benefit to warrant the additional expense. Monitoring will be performed to provide early detection of any potential contaminant migration.

12. **Comment:** On the landfills, I did mention the bio-barrier, and the very best landfill at all is something that has a geomembrane and then about six feet of material on it so that the --- and the gravel soil cover for burrowing animals so that the water can infiltrate the cap, be held at a time until evaporation removes all the water, and you actually can-- and that's how caliche is formed. So you actually make the soil cover less permeable with time by natural processes. (T-I21)

Response: The exact design of the soil cap will be determined by an engineering evaluation during the remedial design stage. This comment will be considered when the final design specifications are determined.

Risk Assessment

13. **Comment:** I didn't see any results of a baseline risk assessment for alternative 2 and 3 considered for landfill areas. Was there any performed? (W-I5)

Response: Due to the incomplete characterization of these sites, a quantitative baseline risk assessment was not possible. The Agencies applied the presumptive remedy process to these areas to reduce the overall cost of the project and still implement the appropriate remedial action. No baseline risk assessment was performed. The qualitative risk calculations are provided in the Summary Assessment reports, and show there is no significant risk to human health.

14. **Comment:** ... in my judgement, the amount of risk from the contaminants in the landfills and the relatively small amount of water infiltrating is never going to be an insult to the aquifer. So, I really support your preferred alternative on that: on the landfills.

And again, I think your analysis is very good ... basically because it confirms my preconceived notion. (T-I16)

Response: The agencies appreciate the time and effort that the commentor took to evaluate the material, attend the presentations, and provide comments on the information.

Landfill Units Alternative #1, No Action

15. **Comment:** Gentlemen, again, given an un-pressured choice, it would make more sense to apply alternative 1, No Action. It is doubtful there would ever be an occasion to build homes and playgrounds over that site in three or four lifetimes. When we become serious about spending tax money the above would apply. (W-T22)

[Having said that,] the only alternative would be alternative 2, which should be more than adequate to meet the criteria of the Nuke Kooks. We see the day when our government will be bankrupt. Then what alternative will you apply? (W-T24)

Response: The Agencies rejected Alternative One (No Action) because these areas were not fully characterized, and the cost to support a No Action decision would be prohibitive. Alternative One has no provision to restrict access to these areas. Although it may appear unlikely that these areas will be used for residential purposes, it is possible. The Agencies believed that the cost of Alternative Two is reasonable for the protection it will provide to public health and the environment.

16. **Comment:** I do not agree that a $2,026,000 expense is warranted for the landfill operable units. With finite funds available and the minuscule risk of these landfill units, it would appear that an inexpensive 30-year "monitoring only" program would be satisfactory. If there has been so little migration of contaminants that some landfill units can't even be found after 30 to 40 years, it is a waste of resources to do more than monitor (call it Alternative 1).

With either alternative 2 or 3, monitoring could show the need for more action after 30 years. Do the same with Alternative 1 and save millions of dollars to attack the problems that can use additional resources. (W-I23)

Response: Currently, the landfill areas are unevenly covered and debris is present on the surface in some places. This condition does not reduce the potential for wind erosion, infiltration by rain or snowmelt, and does not minimize the potential migration of leachate to the aquifer. Although there is no current evidence that migration has occurred, this remedy is not protective of the environment.

The installation of the soil cover is only a small portion of the cost to implement this action. The installation of monitoring wells and the long term analysis of water samples make up the majority of the cost. The Agencies believe that the cost to install the cover is reasonable and worthwhile for the added protection achieved.

The Agencies concur that Alternative 2 is the best choice.

17. **Comment:** At the public presentation, I noted that the proposed native soil cover (Option #2) is the proposed method of capping the landfill areas. Option #3, which was over 3 times more costly would include an engineered soil covering with clay to prevent the infiltration of water through the cap.

I support the proposed action of capping, however, I feel that a combination of these two options could be accomplished in a reasonably easy manner. (W-I25) (See comment W-I13 for complete comment).

Response: Alternative 2 will prevent contact with the landfill contents, and use of native soil will cost less than any combination of soil with clay. In an arid climate, such as that present at the INEL, leaching is not as great a concern as it would be in other areas, and the additional cost would not result in any additional benefit.

Landfill Alternative #3, Containment with Single Barrier Cover

18. **Comment:** Two or more of the audience and a respected engineer with much experience differed regarding whether or not the impervious layer should be installed over the municipal waste. The impervious layer is vital and might be as presented the preferred choice (#3 - at some $32 million) but less costly and more effective in the long run than choice #2 (about $12 Million). (W-B26)

Response: The Agencies have determined that a native soil cover is adequate to prevent direct contact with the landfill contents; in an arid climate, use of an impervious layer does not necessary provide a significant added benefit. Monitoring will also be performed to ensure the effectiveness of the covers.

General Comments on Public Meeting/Public Participation

19. **Comment:** I'd like to thank the presenters for bringing this to us tonight. I am glad that they were kind of lumped together in that I would have hated to have blown a perfectly good evening on a landfill and a ditch. And with that in mind, I think that the landfills and ditches certainly are a very minor part of the problems we have at INEL. I would hope, however, that DOE and others do continue to monitor these sites for future problems and that they continue to bring these sites, as insignificant as they may seem, forward to the public and let the public make their decisions based on the information that is available rather than assuming that these are too small for our concern. Thank you. (T-B27)

Response: Monitoring will continue at the Industrial Waste Ditch and Landfill Sites, and the Agencies will continue to provide public comment opportunities for all INEL remediation projects.

20. **Comment:** I would like to comment on your plans for clean up at nine separate landfills at your Naval Reactors Facility at INEL. I attended your information meeting in Moscow, ID on April 21, 1994 and was very impressed by the presentation. I feel that any cleanup is of course good and worthy. (W-M28)

Response: The Agencies appreciate the time and effort that the commentor took to evaluate the material, attend the presentations, and provide comments on the information presented by the Agencies.

21. **Comment:** The amount of advertising on radio and T.V. before the 20 April 94 Boise meeting was commendable and probably responsible for more public attendance.

The visuals of the presentation boards on easels were superb. The speakers seemed cordial and well prepared with others available with on-site experience to address questions and other aspects.

I hope the presentation boards and visuals will be preserved to use again at schools and other public meetings. We do hope for continuous consideration of costs for effective solutions. (W-B29)

Response: The Agencies will evaluate the use of the presentation materials in other settings. The INEL Community Relations office retains these materials for future use. A comparison of cost versus benefit will continue to be performed for all environmental restoration activities at the INEL.

22. **Comment:** No comments at this time, but would like to receive a copy of the Record of Decision and Responsiveness Summary. (W-P30)

Response: The Agencies appreciate the time and effort that the commentor took to evaluate the material. Copies of the Record of Decision with the Responsiveness Summary will be provided to individuals who request them.

23. **Comment:** First, I would like to thank both you and the Westinghouse Electric Corporation representative, Mr. Nieslanik, for the presentation provided at the Grand Teton Mall. It was informative, well presented and the visual displays were easily understood. (W-I31)

Response: The Agencies appreciate the time and effort that the commentor took to evaluate the material, attend the presentations, and provide comments on the information presented.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC COMMENT/RESPONSE LIST

PUBLIC COMMENT/RESPONSE LIST

All of the comments submitted by the public in either written or verbal form were tabulated and assigned a code number. The commentors are listed alphabetically in the first column, the comment code appears in the second column. The first symbol in the code indicates if the comment was written (W) or transcribed by the court reporter present at the public meetings. The second symbol indicates the geographic area the comment was received from; 'B' for Boise, 'I' for Idaho Falls, 'M' for Moscow, 'P' for Pocatello, or 'T' for Twin Falls. The page number the response to the comment appears on is listed in the third column.

NAME	COMMENT CODE	RESPONSE PAGE
Barraclough, Jack	T-I3	A-5
Barraclough, Jack	T-I4	A-5
Barraclough, Jack	T-I9	A-5
Barraclough, Jack	T-I16	A-11
Barraclough, Jack	T-I21	A-10
Barry, Warren	W-T24	A-11
Barry, Warren	W-T22	A-11
Bjornsen, Fritz	T-B27	A-13
Brissenden, Marjorie	W-B26	A-13
Brissenden, Marjorie	W-B29	A-14
Broscious, Chuck	T-M1	A-6
Broscious, Chuck	T-M14	A-9
Creek, Alex	W-I18	A-10
Drewes, Kenneth	W-I11	A-7, A-8
Drewes, Kenneth	W-I13	A-8
Drewes, Kenneth	W-I25	A-5, A-12
Drewes, Kenneth	W-I31	A-14
Hamilton, Joel	T-M7	A-7
Hampsen, W. L.	W-B6	A-6
Hampsen, W. L.	W-B10	A-7
Hampsen, W. L.	W-B20	A-10
Leedom, George L.	W-M19	A-10
Leedom, George L.	W-M28	A-13
Rice, Charles M.	W-I8	A-7
Rice, Charles M.	W-I23	A-12
Sorensen, Stan	W-P30	A-14
Straka, M.	W-I5	A-11
White, C. E.	T-I12	A-7

APPENDIX C: ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING LABORATORY
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE NRF
TRACK 2 INVESTIGATION OPERABLE UNIT 8-05
10/24/94

FILE NUMBER

AR3.6 TRACK 2 DECISION STATEMENT

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-94/082
Title: Doe Decision Statement and Feasibility Study for OU 8-05 and 8-06, and Summary Report for Operable Unit 8-06
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D., Pierre, W.
Date: 04/11/94

AR3.14 TRACK 2 SUMMARY REPORTS

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-93/301
Title: Track 2 Summary Report for NRF Operable Unit 8-05
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D., Pierre, W.
Date: 11/15/93

AR4.2 FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORTS

▲ Document #: NR-IBO-94-048
Title: Draft Feasibility Study for NRF Landfill Areas (Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D., Pierre, W.
Date: 03/11/94

▲ Document #: 5668
Title: Feasibility Study for NRF Landfill Areas (Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D., Pierre, W.
Date: 11/15/93

FILE NUMBER

AR4.3 PROPOSED PLAN

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-94/034
Title: Transmittal Letter for NRF Operable Units 8-03,-20 and 22 (Track 1 Investigations), 8-05 and 06 (Landfill Site Track 2 Investigations, and 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch RI/FS)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 02/28/94

▲ Document #: 5770
Title: Proposed Plan for NRF OU 8-03,-20 and 22 (Track 1), 8-05 and 06 (Landfill Site Track 2) and 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch RI/FS)
Author: INEL Community Relations
Recipient: N/A
Date: 04/01/94

AR5.1 RECORD OF DECISION

▲ Document #: 5781
Title: Record of Decision for the NRF Industrial Waste Ditch and the Landfill Areas
Author: Naval Reactors Facility
Recipient: N/A
Date: 09/28/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-07, Volume VIII**

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

▲ Document #: ERD1-070-91*
Title: Pre-signature Implementation of the CERCLA Interagency Agreement Action Plan
Author: EPA, Findley, C. E.
Recipient: DOE, Solecki, J. E.
Date: 05/17/91

FILE NUMBER

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 3205*
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/22/91

▲ Document #: 2919*
Title: INEL Action Plan For Implementation of the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/22/91

▲ Document #: 1088-06-29-120*
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 12/04/91

▲ Document #: 3298*
Title: Response to Comments on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 02/21/92

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10340(92)*
Title: Track 1 Sites: Guidance for Assessing Low Probability Hazard Sites at the INEL
Author: INEL, EPA, IDHW
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/01/92

FILE NUMBER

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS (continued)

- Document #: DOE/ID-10389 Rev. 6*
  Title: Track 2 Sites: Guidance for Assessing Low Probability Hazard Sites at the INEL
  Author: INEL, EPA, IDHW
  Recipient: N/A
  Date: 01/01/94

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED

- Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-256*
  Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
  Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
  Recipient: Andrus, C,D,
  Date: 07/07/92

- Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-257*
  Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
  Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
  Recipient: Polityka, C.
  Date: 07/07/92

- Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-258*
  Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
  Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
  Recipient: Edmo, K.
  Date: 07/07/92

- Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-007*
  Title: Invitation to Natural Trustee Representatives to Discuss Natural Resources and Environmental Restoration at the INEL
  Author: Hinman, M.B.
  Recipient: Addressee List
  Date: 01/25/93

FILE NUMBER

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED (continued)

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-097*
Title: Agenda for Meeting of Potential Natural Resource Trustees' on March 17, 1993
Author: Twitchell, R.L.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 03/02/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-159*
Title: INEL Natural Resource Trustee Meeting "Group Memory" March 17, 1993
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 03/30/93

Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-162*
Title: Department of Energy Idaho Field Office (DOE-ID) Proposal for Consultation and Coordination between Natural Resource Trustees
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 04/02/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-276*
Title: Department of Energy Idaho Field Office (DOE-ID) Action Item Report to Potential Natural Resource Trustees
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 06/16/93

▲ Document #: 5337*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Representation Designation
Author: Andrus, C.D., Governor
Recipient: Pitrolo, A.A.
Date: 08/11/92

FILE NUMBER

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED (continued)

▲ Document #: 5338*
Title: Response to Natural Resource Notification
Author: Polityka, C.S.
Recipient: Pitrolo, A.A.
Date: 08/28/92

AR10.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

▲ Document #: 5739*
Title: Public Notice - Future Land Use Scenarios Report Available
Author: INEL Community Relations
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/19/94

AR10.4 PUBLIC MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

▲ Document #: 5703
Title: Public Meeting Transcripts for the NRF Industrial Waste Ditch and Landfill Areas
Author: Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 05/24/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-07, Volume VIII**

AR10.6 PRESS RELEASES

▲ Document #: 5640
Title: DOE Seeks Public Comment on Industrial Waste Ditch and Landfills at the NRF
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 03/01/94

FILE NUMBER

AR11.1 EPA GUIDANCE

▲ Document #: 5163 Revision 3*
Title: Administrative Record List of Guidance Documents
Author: EPA
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/12/92

AR11.4 TECHNICAL SOURCES

▲ Document #: NR-IBO-94-076
Title: Radioactivity controls In Prototype Plants at the Naval Reactors Facility
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 03/31/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-01, Volume I**

AR11.8 LAND USE DOCUMENTS

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10440*
Title: Long-Term Land Use Future Scenarios for The Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/01/94

AR12.1 EPA COMMENTS

▲ Document #: 5636
Title: Track 2 Summary Report for the Naval Reactors Facility OU 8-05
Author: Meyer, L.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 12/20/93

FILE NUMBER

AR12.1 EPA COMMENTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 5663
Title: Draft Feasibility Study for NRF Landfill Areas (Operable Units (OU) 8-05 and 8-06)
Author: Meyer, L.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/29/94

AR12.2 IDHW COMMENTS

▲ Document #: 5657
Title: IDHW-DEQ Recommendations for Track-Two Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/23/94

▲ Document #: 5664
Title: Review of the Draft Proposed Plan for OU 8-05, 8-06, and 8-07
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/31/94

▲ Document #: 5666
Title: IDHW Comments - Review of the Draft Focused Feasibility Study for Operable Units (OU) 8-05 and 8-06
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 04/04/94

* **Document filed in INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) Administrative Record Binder**

IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING LABORATORY
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE NRF
TRACK 2 INVESTIGATION OPERABLE UNIT 8-06
10/24/94

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME I
FILE NUMBER

AR3.14 TRACK 2 SUMMARY REPORT

▲ Document #: 5669
Title: Track 2 Summary Report for Naval Reactors Facility OU 8-06
Author: Golder Associates, Inc.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 04/01/94

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME II

AR3.6 TRACK 2 INVESTIGATION

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-94/082
Title: DOE Decision Statement and Feasibility Study for Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06 and Summary Report for Operable Unit 8-06
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 04/11/94

AR3.21 SCHEDULES

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-94/018
Title: Revised Schedules for OU 8-06 and 8-09 Track 2 Investigations
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 02/07/94

AR4.2 FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORTS

▲ Document #: NR-IBO-94/048
Title: Draft Feasibility Study for NRF Landfill Areas (Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D., Pierre, W.
Date: 03/11/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-05, Volume I**

FILE NUMBER

AR4.2 FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 5668
Title: Feasibility Study for NRF Landfill Areas (Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 04/01/94

AR4.3 PROPOSED PLAN

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-94/034
Title: Transmittal Letter and Draft Proposed Plan for NRF OU 8-03,-20 and 22 (Track 1), 8-05 and 06 (Landfill Site Track 2) and 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch RI/FS)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 02/28/94

▲ Document #: 5770
Title: Proposed Plan for NRF OU 8-03,-20 and 22 (Track 1), 8-05 and 06 (Landfill Site Track 2) and 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch RI/FS)
Author: INEL Community Relations
Recipient: N/A
Date: 04/01/94

AR5.1 RECORD OF DECISION

▲ Document #: 5781
Title: Record of Decision for the NRF Industrial Waste Ditch and the Landfill Areas
Author: Naval Reactors Facility
Recipient: N/A
Date: 09/28/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-07, Volume VIII**

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

▲ Document #: ERD1-070-91*
Title: Pre-signature Implementation of the CERCLA Interagency Agreement Action Plan
Author: EPA, Findley, C. E.
Recipient: DOE, Solecki, J. E.
Date: 05/17/91

FILE NUMBER

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 3205*
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/22/91

▲ Document #: 2919*
Title: INEL Action Plan For Implementation of the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/22/91

▲ Document #: 1088-06-29-120*
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 12/04/91

▲ Document #: 3298*
Title: Response to Comments on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 02/21/92

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10340(92)*
Title: Track 1 Sites: Guidance for Assessing Low Probability Hazard Sites at the INEL
Author: INEL, EPA, IDHW
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/01/92

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10389 Rev. 6*
Title: Track 2 Sites: Guidance for Assessing Low Probability Hazard Sites at the INEL
Author: INEL, EPA, IDHW
Recipient: N/A
Date: 01/01/94

FILE NUMBER

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-256*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
Recipient: Andrus, C,D,
Date: 07/07/92

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-257*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
Recipient: Polityka, C.
Date: 07/07/92

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-258*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
Recipient: Edmo, K.
Date: 07/07/92

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-007*
Title: Invitation to Natural Trustee Representatives to Discuss Natural Resources and Environmental Restoration at the INEL
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 01/25/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-097*
Title: Agenda for Meeting of Potential Natural Resource Trustees' on 03/17/93
Author: Twitchell, R.L.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 03/02/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-159*
Title: INEL Natural Resource Trustee Meeting "Group Memory" March 17, 1993
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 03/30/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-162*
Title: DOE-ID Proposal for Consultation and Coordination between Natural Resource Trustees
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 04/02/93

FILE NUMBER

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED (continued)

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-276*
Title: Department of Energy Idaho Field Office (DOE-ID) Action Item Report to Potential Natural Resource Trustees
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 06/16/93

▲ Document #: 5337*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Representation Designation
Author: Andrus, C.D., Governor
Recipient: Pitrolo, A.A.
Date: 08/11/92

▲ Document #: 5338*
Title: Response to Natural Resource Notification
Author: Polityka, C.S.
Recipient: Pitrolo, A.A.
Date: 08/28/92

AR10.4 PUBLIC MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

▲ Document #: 5703
Title: Public Meeting Transcripts for the NRF Industrial Waste Ditch and Landfill Areas
Author: Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 05/24/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-07, Volume VIII**

AR10.6 PRESS RELEASES

▲ Document #: 5640
Title: DOE Seeks Public Comment on Industrial Waste Ditch
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 03/01/94

FILE NUMBER

AR10.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

▲ Document #: 5739*
Title: Public Notice - Future Land Use Scenarios Report Available
Author: INEL Community Relations
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/19/94

AR11.1 EPA GUIDANCE

▲ Document #: 5163 Revision 3*
Title: Administrative Record List of Guidance Documents
Author: EPA
Recipient: N/A
Date: 10/04/93

AR11.4 TECHNICAL SOURCES

▲ Document #: NR-IBO-94-076
Title: Radioactivity controls In Prototype Plants at the Naval Reactors Facility
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 03/31/94

NOTE: **This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder, Operable Unit 8-01, *Volume I***

AR11.8 LAND USE DOCUMENTS

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10440*
Title: Long-Term Land Use Future Scenarios for The Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/01/94

AR12.1 EPA COMMENTS

▲ Document #: 5663
Title: Draft Feasibility Study for NRF Landfill Areas (Operable Units (OU) 8-05 and 8-06)
Author: Meyer, L.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/29/94

FILE NUMBER

AR12.1 EPA COMMENTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 5667
Title: Preliminary Draft Track 2 Summary Report Comments for the Naval Reactors Facility Operable Unit (OU) 8-06 and Position Statement for 8-06 Units
Author: Meyer, L.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/30/94

AR12.2 IDHW COMMENTS

▲ Document #: 5657
Title: IDHW-DEQ Recommendations for Track-Two Operable Units 8-05 and 8-06
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/23/94

▲ Document #: 5664
Title: Review of the Draft Proposed Plan for Operable Units (OU) 8-05, 8-06, and 8-07
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/31/94

▲ Document #: 5665
Title: Review of the Preliminary Draft Track 2 Summary Report for Operable Unit (OU) 8-06
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 04/04/94

▲ Document #: 5666
Title: IDHW Comments - Review of the Draft Focused Feasibility Study for Operable Units (OU) 8-05 and 8-06
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 04/04/94

• Document filed in INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) Administrative Record Binder

IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING LABORATORY
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX FOR THE NRF
EXTERIOR INDUSTRIAL WASTE DITCH RI / FS OPERABLE UNIT 8-07
10/24/94

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME I
FILE NUMBER

AR3.3 RI/FS WORK PLAN

▲ Document #: 5195
Title: RI/FS Final Work Plan For the Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch (IWD) OU 8-07, Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho Falls, Idaho
Author: Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Recipient: N/A
Date: 09/24/92

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-92/328
Title: DOE/IBO Transmittal of Final Work Plan for the RI/FS for the NRF IWD
Author: Newbry, R.D.E., DOE-IBO
Recipient: Nygard, D., EPA
Date: 11/26/91

▲ Document #: 5196
Title: Correspondence between EPA, State of Idaho, and DOE-IBO
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 09/24/92

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME II

AR3.4 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORTS

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-93/198,VOL. 1
Title: Transmittal Letter and Draft Remedial Investigation Report for NRF Operable Unit 8-07
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 07/15/93

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME III

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-93/198,VOL. 2
Title: Draft Remedial Investigation Report for NRF OU 8-07
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 07/15/93

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME IV
FILE NUMBER

AR3.12 RI/FS REPORTS

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-93/296,VOL. 1
Title: Transmittal Letter and Draft Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study Report for NRF Operable Unit 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 11/08/93

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME V

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-93/296,VOL. 2
Title: Draft Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study Report for NRF Operable Unit 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 11/08/93

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME VI

▲ Document #: 5626,VOL. 1
Title: Final Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study Report for NRF Operable Unit 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch)
Author: Lee, S.D.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 02/01/94

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME VII

AR3.12 RI/FS REPORTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 5626,VOL. 2
Title: Final Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study Report for NRF Operable Unit 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch)
Author: Lee, S.D.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 02/01/94

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD VOLUME VIII
FILE NUMBER

AR4.3 PROPOSED PLAN

▲ Document #: NR:IBO-94/034
Title: Transmittal Letter and Draft Proposed Plan for NRF OU 8-03,-20 and 22 (Track 1), 8-05 and 06 (Landfill Site Track 2) and 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch RI/FS)
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 02/28/94

▲ Document #: 5770
Title: Proposed Plan for NRF OU 8-03,-20 and 22 (Track 1), 8-05 and 06 (Landfill Site Track 2) and 8-07 (Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch RI/FS)
Author: INEL Community Relations
Recipient: N/A
Date: 04/01/94

AR5.1 RECORD OF DECISION

▲ Document #: 5781
Title: Record of Decision for the NRF Industrial Waste Ditch and the Landfill Areas
Author: Naval Reactors Facility
Recipient: N/A
Date: 09/28/94

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

▲ Document #: ERD1-070-91•
Title: Pre-signature Implementation of the CERCLA Interagency Agreement Action Plan
Author: EPA, Findley, C. E.
Recipient: DOE, Solecki, J. E.
Date: 05/17/91

▲ Document #: 3205•
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/22/91

FILE NUMBER

AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS (continued)

▲ Document #: 2919*
Title: INEL Action Plan For Implementation of the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/22/91

▲ Document #: 1088-06-29-120*
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 12/04/91

▲ Document #: 3298*
Title: Response to Comments on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 02/21/92

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10340(92)*
Title: Track 1 Sites: Guidance for Assessing Low Probability Hazard Sites at the INEL
Author: INEL, EPA, IDHW
Recipient: N/A
Date: 07/01/92

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10389 Rev. 6*
Title: Track 2 Sites: Guidance for Assessing Low Probability Hazard Sites at the INEL
Author: INEL, EPA, IDHW
Recipient: N/A
Date: 01/01/94

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-256*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
Recipient: Andrus, C,D,
Date: 07/07/92

FILE NUMBER

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED (continued)

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-257*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
Recipient: Polityka, C.
Date: 07/07/92

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-92-258*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Notification
Author: Pitrolo, A.A.
Recipient: Edmo, K.
Date: 07/07/92

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-007*
Title: Invitation to Natural Trustee Representatives to Discuss Natural Resources and Environmental Restoration at the INEL
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 01/25/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-097*
Title: Agenda for Meeting of Potential Natural Resource Trustees' on March 17, 1993
Author: Twitchell, R.L.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 03/02/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-159*
Title: INEL Natural Resource Trustee Meeting "Group Memory" March 17, 1993
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 03/30/93

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-162*
Title: Department of Energy Idaho Field Office (DOE-ID) Proposal for Consultation and Coordination between Natural Resource Trustees
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 04/02/93

FILE NUMBER

AR9.1 NOTICES ISSUED (continued)

▲ Document #: AM/SES-ESD-93-276*
Title: DOE-ID Action Item Report to Potential Natural Resource Trustees
Author: Hinman, M.B.
Recipient: Addressee List
Date: 06/16/93

▲ Document #: 5337*
Title: Natural Resource Trustee Representation Designation
Author: Andrus, C.D., Governor
Recipient: Pitrolo, A.A.
Date: 08/11/92

▲ Document #: 5338*
Title: Response to Natural Resource Notification
Author: Polityka, C.S.
Recipient: Pitrolo, A.A.
Date: 08/28/92

AR10.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

▲ Document #: 5739*
Title: Public Notice - Future Land Use Scenarios Report Available
Author: INEL Community Relations
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/19/94

AR10.4 PUBLIC MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

▲ Document #: 5703
Title: Public Meeting Transcripts for the NRF IWD and Landfill Areas
Author: Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Recipient: N/A
Date: 05/24/94

AR10.6 PRESS RELEASES

▲ Document #: 5640
Title: DOE Seeks Public Comment on Industrial Waste Ditch
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 03/01/94

FILE NUMBER

AR11.1 EPA GUIDANCE

▲ Document #: 5163 Revision 3*
Title: Administrative Record List of Guidance Documents
Author: EPA
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/12/92

AR11.4 TECHNICAL SOURCES

▲ Document #: NR-IBO-94-076
Title: Radioactivity controls In Prototype Plants at the Naval Reactors Facility
Author: Newbry, R.D.E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 03/31/94

This document can be found in Administrative Record Binder OU 8-01

AR11.8 LAND USE DOCUMENTS

▲ Document #: DOE/ID-10440*
Title: Long-Term Land Use Future Scenarios for The Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
Author: N/A
Recipient: N/A
Date: 08/01/94

AR12.1 EPA COMMENTS

▲ Document #: 5634
Title: EPA Comments: Draft Remedial Investigation for the Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch Operable Unit 8-07
Author: Meyer, L.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 09/02/93

▲ Document #: 5638
Title: EPA Comments: Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for the Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch
Author: Meyer, L.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 12/23/93

FILE NUMBER

AR12.2 IDHW COMMENTS

▲ Document #: 5635
Title: IDHW Comments: Technical Review of the Draft RI/FS
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Bradley, T.M.
Date: 09/02/93

▲ Document #: 5637
Title: IDHW Comments: Technical Review of the Draft RI/FS
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 12/21/93

▲ Document #: 5664
Title: Review of the Draft Proposed Plan for Operable Units (OU) 8-05, 8-06, and 8-07
Author: English, M.
Recipient: Newbry, R.D.E.
Date: 03/31/94

AR12.3 DOE RESOLUTIONS TO COMMENTS

▲ Document #: NR-IBO-93/272
Title: Response to EPA/IDHW Comments On IWD RI Report
Author: Newbry, R.D. E.
Recipient: Nygard, D.; Pierre, W.
Date: 10/04/93

• Document filed in INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) Administrative Record Binder